



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

C

8324

427

HD WIDENER



HW JTS 2

Cover - Some Authentic Extracts - 1858

C 8324.427

HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY



THE GIFT OF
HAVERFORD COLLEGE LIBRARY
HAVERFORD, PENNSYLVANIA

Gurney matter
SOME

(15)

AUTHENTIC EXTRACTS,

WITH A FEW DEDUCTIONS AND OBSERVATIONS

IN RELATION TO THE

STATE OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

"STAND YE IN THE WAYS, AND SEE, AND ASK FOR THE OLD PATHS, WHERE IS THE
GOOD WAY, AND WALK THEREIN, AND YE SHALL FIND REST FOR YOUR SOULS."

Jer. vi. 16.

Smith 1457

BY MORRIS COPE.

WEST CHESTER:
E. F. JAMES, BOOK, CARD & JOB PRINTER.
1858.

C 8324.427

✓

MARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
GIFT OF
HAVERFORD COLLEGE LIBRARY
July 9, 1935

We have examined the annexed document, (in manuscript,) and being satisfied with it; have encouraged its publication, and commend it to the careful, serious attention of the honest inquirer after truth.

DAVID COPE,	WILLIAM WALTER,
SAMUEL COPE,	JOSHUA SHARPLESS,
MOSES BAILY,	LEVI WICKERSHAM,
WM. N. SCARLET,	DANIEL THOMPSON,
SOLOMON LUKENS,	ABIAH COPE,
JOSEPH CHAMBERS,	BENJAMIN MAULE,
JOSHUA B. PUSEY.	

EXTRACTS, DEDUCTIONS AND OBSERVATIONS.

While the members of the Society of Friends differ in sentiment on many points now at issue, they appear generally united in acknowledging that difficulties do exist; and although an abundance has been written, and much more said, in relation to those controverted matters, yet no definite satisfactory conclusion has been arrived at, wherein all can acquiesce and unite.

And, inasmuch as it stands a recorded decision of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, (in 1849,) that, "every man has the natural and religious right to express his honest opinions in a proper spirit and manner, upon any published sentiment which he approves or disapproves.

"If he spreads opinions in opposition to the principles of the religious society to which he belongs, he is liable to excommunication for a departure from its faith.

"But to attempt to bring a man under censure for defending the Society against error, by warning the members against the unsoundness of certain published works, not only violates a plain, unquestionable right, but would be censuring him for the faithful discharge of his religious duty as a watchman, and giving support to opinions which, as a body, the Society entirely disapproves."

And again: "If unsound doctrines are not to be testified against, and the flock warned of their pernicious influence, but the consistent exercised members are to be accused of detraction, when they declare their dissent from published errors, then farewell to the maintainance of any sound doctrines in the church of Christ."

Can there be a doubt entertained by any old-fashioned, honest-hearted member of our Society, but what the early Friends and standard authors amongst them, had a clear, spiritual sense and understanding furnished by the great head of his church, through the quickening power of the Holy Spirit operating on their minds, whereby they were gathered to be a united body of distinct Christians, holding certain doctrinal views; and that by close attention and obedience to the unction received, they (as the apostles and disciples of our Lord had done before them,) spake and wrote in unison of language, walked by the same rule, and minded the same thing, and were thus brought into unity of feeling, one with another, and a harmonious exercise and labor for the cause and honor of truth?

And was it not for want of humbly abiding under the quickening power of truth revealed in the heart, and a soaring above the restraining power of the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, that was the stumbling-block whereon a Perrot, a Wilkinson and Story, a Kieth, and a Hicks, made shipwreck of faith and a good conscience? And who were all testified against, in due time, as being out of the truth, and sowers of the seed of discord and confusion in the church.

And do not like causes produce like effects? Did not the early Friends know experimentally that, "nothing makes a man truly a Christian but the life of Christianity inwardly ruling in his heart; so nothing makes a Church, but the gathering of several true Christians into one body. Now where all these members lose this life, there the church ceaseth to be, though they still uphold the form, and retain the name."—*R. Barclay's Apology*, page 301.

Was not primitive Quakerism built upon that rock which is the alone sure foundation? And if so, is it to be changed, or destroyed by the winds and the waves of apostacy, although they may beat vehemently upon it?

Let the natural capacity, and the human acquirements of man be what they may; must he not, in his searching after truth, ever remain in a bewildered state of uncertainty and doubt; unless his spiritual eye shall be anointed by the same sun of righteousness, in whom the early Friends trusted, and were not deceived?

Robert Barclay, in his works, Vol. I., page 472-3, has this language, viz: "And some not abiding in subjection to the truth in themselves, were not contented with that place and station in the body, which God had placed them in; but became vainly puffed up in their fleshly minds, intruding into those things which they have not seen; and would needs be innovators, given to change, and introducing new doctrines and practices, not only differing, but contrary to what was already delivered in the beginning; making parties, causing divisions and rents, stumbling the weak, and denying, despising and reviling the apostles and messengers of Christ, the elders of the Church, who loved not their lives unto death, but through much care, and travail, and watchings, and whippings, and bonds, and beatings, in daily jeopardy, gathered us by the mighty power of God in the most precious truth."

And the apostle Paul, in his epistle to the Galatians, 1-9, has this language, viz: "As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have

received, let him be accursed." And he goes on in the 11th and 12th verses to say: "But I certify you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached of me, is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."

And do we not believe that George Fox, preached the same Gospel the Apostles did, and that he might in his measure have adopted Paul's testimony, "I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." Then what (may we not, with great propriety, put the question to ourselves individually?) would be the Apostle's decision in the case, if tried by his rule of judging relative to sound doctrine, should any arise in the Society of Friends, and promulgate any other Gospel or doctrine, in opposition to that which George Fox has already clearly set forth?

Can we for a moment suppose that the mind of any in our day has been more divinely illuminated by the revelation of Jesus Christ, than the Apostle Paul or George Fox experienced? Or do we believe that the same heavenly revelation which instructed George Fox to preach and to write as he did, has at any subsequent period instructed a fellow member of the same religious Society to promulgate doctrines in opposition to his?

Here let us leave the axe at the root of the tree, and presently judge of the tree by its fruit. Let us endeavor honestly to probe the sore to its bottom, in order that the wound may be healed; and not strive to cover up with a plaster of deception, bearing on its face the inscription of charity and love. Let us endeavor to get to the root and foundation from whence has arisen the present distracted and confused state of our once peaceful and highly favored society. Let us hear what Joseph John Gurney has himself said, and try him by his own rule of judging, viz: "Should a member of the religious Society of Friends, for example, be found professing and disseminating socinian principles, we should consider it our duty, without the least breach of charity toward him, to annul his membership. The reason is plain, viz: That if we allowed religious fellowship with such an individual, we should, in the face of all the world, sanction his errors, and support them by the authority of the respective churches to which we belong. In such a case the guilt of his heresy would be ours as well as his own."—*Phila. Friend*, vol. VI., page 15.

Who can now object to bringing J. J. Gurney's sentiments into a close comparison with those of George Fox on the same points

of doctrine, and endeavoring with the light of truth to determine whether, by his own rule of judging, he was justly entitled to the station and position he occupied in the religious Society of which he was a member by birth.

George Fox says: "As I went toward Nottingham on a first day, in the morning, with friends to a meeting there, when I came on the top of a hill in sight of the town, I espied the great steeple-house, and the Lord said unto me, 'thou must go cry against yonder great idol, and against the worshippers therein.' I said nothing of this to the Friends, but went with them to the meeting, where the mighty power of the Lord God was amongst us; in which I left Friends sitting in the meeting, and went to the steeple-house. When I came there all the people looked like fallow ground, and the Priest, like a great lump of earth, stood in his pulpit above; he took for his text these words of Peter, 'We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your heart.' He told the people this was the Scriptures, by which they were to try all doctrines, religions and opinions. Now the Lord's power was so mighty upon me, and so strong in me, that I could not hold, but was made to cry out, 'oh! no; it is not the Scriptures;' and told them it was the Holy Spirit, by which the holy men of God gave forth the Scriptures, whereby opinions, religions and judgments were to be tried; for it led into all truth, and so gave the knowledge of all truth. The Jews had the Scriptures, yet resisted the Holy Ghost, and rejected Christ, the bright morning star. They persecuted him and his apostles, and took upon them to try their doctrines by the Scriptures, but erred in judgment, and did not try them right, because they tried without the Holy Ghost."—*G. Fox's Jour.*, vol. I., page 115-6.

J. J. Gurney says, in his brief remarks on the impartiality in the interpretation of Scripture, that "the idea was at one time rather prevalent among the members of our Society, that when the Apostle used the term 'a more sure word of Prophecy,' he was not alluding to any word written, but to that divine illuminating influence by which the prophets were inspired, and which guides the Christian believer into all truth. Such a view of the passage is, indeed, but seldom insisted upon at the present day; but as it is sometimes advanced. I think it right to acknowledge my own sentiment, that it is at variance with that simplicity, which we ought always to maintain in the perusal and interpretation of the sacred writings.

"That the very sure word of prophecy was that which had been uttered and was written, is evident from the immediate context, in which the Apostle distinguishes this word from the day star in the heart, and at the same time identifies it (as I conceive) with prophecy of the Scripture.

"The Scriptures are a light to which at all times, and under all circumstances, we do well to take heed; but they shine only in a dark place, until the minds of those who read them are illuminated by the Holy Spirit; until the day dawn, and the day star arise in our hearts."

Here doubtless we have the genuine sentiments of our modern expounder of Quakerism, who fully proves himself to be in perfect unison of feeling on this point with the priest of Nottingham, who preached for hire, and divined for money, and with whom George Fox contended face to face, on that identical doctrine, in the presence of the whole assembly; and who was, then and there, either speaking by the revelation of Jesus Christ; or must he not have been a deluded man?

But let us hear whether George Fox stood alone in his doctrine, as opposed to the priest. What does his cotemporary, the learned and unanswerable apologist, Robert Barclay, say to the case: "As for the more sure word of prophecy, we grant it is the rule, but deny that, that more sure word is the Scriptures; but it is that word in the heart, from which the Scriptures came, and in and by which the Scriptures are to be interpreted. And is it not gross blindness and darkness, to say the Scripture is more sure, than that word, light, life and spirit, from whence they came? Had not the Scriptures all their sureness from the inward testimony of the spirit? How then can they be more sure?"—*Works, vol. I., page 161.*

Although the foregoing contrast is clear and strong; yet inasmuch as J. J. Gurney in his brief remarks contravenes a number of other no less prominent points of doctrine, which the early standard writers in the Society considered as fundamentals; and finally to encompass the whole, pronounces them misinterpretations of Scripture, that "are stepping stones, by which unwary persons may be, in no small degree, assisted in an actual descent into heresy." Let the reader, therefore, hear a few of his remarks, in defining the Gospel. He says, "The word Gospel properly signifies glad tidings." And again: "The declaration that the Gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation, *Rom. 1-16*, has been regarded not as a description of the efficacy of that Gospel, for the salvation of sinners; but as a definition of the Gospel itself,

as if the Gospel of Christ, and the power of God, were convertible terms. Hence it is concluded that the Gospel is not the good news of salvation through a crucified Saviour, but the power of God, or, in other words, the influence of the Holy Spirit in the heart.

"That the tendency of this mistake is to dismiss from our view a most important and fundamental part of Christian truth, that very part on which all the rest is built, is too obvious to require notice. That the Gospel, when the Apostle wrote these words, COL. 1-21, 23, had actually reached every province of the then known inhabited world, or Roman empire, is indeed by no means impossible." George Fox, in an address to Ministering Friends, says, "You, that know and feel the power, you feel the cross of Christ, you feel the Gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."—*Journal*, vol. I., page 242.

And again: "The people of Truro in their reasoning, said, the Gospel was the four books of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John; and they called it natural. I told them it was the power of God, which was preached before Matthew, Mark, Luke and John were written; and it was preached to every creature (of which a great part might never see nor hear of those four books) so that every creature was to obey the power of God; for Christ, the spiritual man, would judge the world according to the Gospel, that is, according to his invisible power."—*Vol. II.*, page 24.

Robert Barclay says: "This saving spiritual light is the Gospel, which the Apostle saith expressly is preached in every creature under heaven; even that very Gospel whereof Paul was made a minister, COL. 1-23. For the Gospel is not a mere declaration of good things, being the 'power of God unto salvation to all those that believe.'—ROM. 1-16. Though the outward declaration of the Gospel be taken sometimes for the Gospel, yet it is but figuratively, and by a metonymy. For to speak properly the Gospel is this inward power and life which preacheth glad tidings in the hearts of all men, offering salvation unto them, etc.—*Apology*, p. 181-2.

And again R. Barclay says: "Was not the promised seed a preaching of the Gospel to Adam?"—*Works*, vol. III., page 395. Those few words, almost equivalent to a volume, appear so full, and so clear, that the Gospel was before Adam; that the rhetoric of a Brown, and the sophistry of a Gurney, appear 'as the small dust of the balance.'

R. Barclay further saith, in Apology page 182: "Now that which may be known of God, is known by the Gospel, which was manifest in them. For those of whom the Apostle speaks had no outward Gospel preached unto them; so that it was by the inward manifestation of the knowledge of God in them, which is indeed the Gospel preached in man, 'that the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith;' that is, it reveals to the soul that which is just, good and righteous; and as the soul receiveth it and believes, righteousness comes more and more to be revealed from one degree of faith to another."

Now hear J. J. Gurney's opposing sentiment, quoting the same Apostle, "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith, (that is, I presume, from the faith of the preacher, to the faith of the hearer) as it is written, the just shall live by faith."—Rom. 1-17. If Gurney's sentiment were true, would it not follow, that where there is no preacher, there can be no faith?

The Apostle Paul, HEB. 11-1, defines faith to be "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." The early friends held the same sentiment. J. J. Gurney, in his essays, page 352, defines faith (and also reason) as a "noble and useful faculty of the human mind," and says, "faith draws near unto that God whom reason has discovered," &c., which may be read thus: A noble and useful faculty of the human mind draws near unto that God whom another noble and useful faculty of the human mind has discovered. A prominent female preacher among the Hicksites said, reason was the star which led the Magi or wise men to Christ. And what sentiment of Elias Hicks on a subject of similar magnitude, when compared with J. J. Gurney's definition of faith, appears more objectionably erroneous or astonishingly absurd.

This is certainly sufficient (though but a small portion of his opposing and objectionable matter) to furnish the reader with data whereon to base his conclusions as to the agreement or disagreement of J. J. Gurney's sentiments with the unsophisticated Quakerism of the early Friends. And are they not as derogatory as those of Elias Hicks?

But further; did not Thomas Shillitoe in his testimony against the writings of J. J. Gurney, delivered but three days before his decease, say, "I therefore declare, unequivocally, against the generality of the writings of J. J. Gurney, as being non-Quaker principles, not sound Quaker principles, but Episcopalian ones; and they have done great mischief in our Society, and the Society will go gradually down if it yields to the further circulation of that

part of his works which they have it in their power to suppress; this is my firm belief. I declare the author is an Episcopalian, not a Quaker. I apprehend J. J. Gurney is no Quaker in principle. Episcopalian views were imbibed from his education, and still remain with him. This is my dying testimony, and I must sign it. If I had been faithful I should have expressed it in the last Yearly Meeting of Ministers and Elders, (1836) but I hope I shall be forgiven." George and Ann Jones, S. L. Grubb, and John Barclay each bore testimony against the un-quakerly doctrines of J. J. Gurney; but was not their concern, in connexion with many others, entirely too little regarded, and hence the rapid spread and eager reception of his sentiments, both in England and America.

It may now also be proper to lay before the reader the opinion of Ralph Wardlaw, a Presbyterian Priest of Scotland, called D. D. in letters which he has published, addressed to the Society of Friends. He says: "I have given in copious extracts the views of J. J. Gurney, on the doctrine of justification. They are clear, simple, scriptural,—but are they Quakerism? Let none be startled by the question; it is not a hasty, inconsiderate one. I shall show you there is room for it. There are large portions of the writings of this highly intelligent and devoted friend, in which we entirely lose sight of the peculiarities of Quaker sentiment, and Quaker phraseology. He seems to lay aside his garb, or rather to divest the system of the costume in which before it had invariably appeared," p. 195. "The terms in which Mr. Gurney invariably speaks of the holy Scriptures, and which it is my delight to see him using, are such as to convert those employed by him respecting the independent influence and guidance of the holy spirit, into little more than words without meaning, p. 351.

"My judgment and my feelings being in thorough accordance with those of Mr. Gurney, in all that he says of the paramount authority of the word of God as contained in the volume of revelation, I cannot see how he can be in harmony with himself, till he has thrown aside the remnant of Quaker doctrine to which he still tenaciously clings. I mean this immediate revelation, under the modified designation by which he has chosen to qualify and recommend it," p. 358.

"Mr. Gurney conceives that every true Quaker is prepared cordially to acknowledge that the Holy Scriptures, and they alone, are a divinely authorized record of all the doctrines which we are

required to believe, and of all the moral principles that are to regulate our actions, not to mention the luminous declaration which they contain of our relative and particular duties. And indeed on this, and various other points, it cannot fail to strike the most superficial reader, what a perfect discordance there is between the writings of Mr. Gurney and those of the early Friends. I am very far from wishing Mr. Gurney to take a single step out of Quakerism, in points where Quakerism is true. In other points, however, he has already taken several, and those, too, even larger strides than any that now remain for him to take." 367

If the reader is not yet fully awakened to the importance of the subject, let him ponder J. J. Gurney's own language, viz:—"Were I required to define Quakerism, I would not describe it as the system so elaborately wrought out by a Barclay, or as the doctrines and maxims of a Penn, or as the deep and refined views of a Pennington; for all these authors have their defects as well as their excellencies. I should call it the religion of the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, without diminution, without addition, and without compromise."

Now intelligent reader pause and consider well the tendency of this uncalled for attack upon those enlightened men, and standard writers in the Society of Friends.

What object could the writer have entertained, unless it be to weaken or destroy our confidence in those devoted worthies, who so patiently suffered for the testimonies of truth; and to prepare the soil of our minds to receive the seed of modified Quakerism, which, when entirely relieved from the restraints of the Cross, will doubtless present a scheme of outside religion increasingly congenial to the reception of the unregenerate and luke-warm professor. But he says Barclay, Penn, and Pennington are defective authors, although their writings possess some excellencies; yet if they are defective, must they not be out of the truth, and not to be relied upon? And certainly if they have added to, subtracted from, and compromised the doctrines of the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; what other conclusion can we arrive at, but that they were themselves deceived, and were deceivers. But let not the reader for a moment entertain such an idea. But rather compare the subsequent doings of J. J. Gurney with his disparaging language just quoted.

Apparently, as if regardless of his former sweeping denunciation of primitive Quakerism, the reader may find this same J. J. Gurney, when requested to furnish an exposition of his faith to

be offered as testimony in a case where property or temporals were at issue in New England, under his solemn affirmation, qualifying and couching the more prominent features of said exhibit, in the identical language, verbatim, of these very men and standard authors in the society, at whose moral integrity, as well as spiritual instructions, he has insiduously hurled the most deadly weapon he could raise against them. And where can the reader find any language used by Elias Hicks toward those pristine worthies, that will bear an equivalent comparison.

Had Robert Barclay as clearly seen our condition as a society in these latter days, (and perhaps he did,) as Moses saw the lapse of the children of Israel, could he have spoken more nearly to the state of our times when he said, "Surely the church can be no ways bettered by the accession of hypocrites, but greatly corrupted and endangered, for open heresies, men may be aware of, and shun such as profess them, when they are separated from the church by her censures; but secret hypocrites may putrify the body, and leaven it, e'er men be aware."—*Apology*, page 512.

Were there not many friends on the continent of America who were exceedingly uneasy with the published sentiments of J. J. Gurney previous to his coming to this country on his visit; and might they not well be so? or in other words, who, that was acquainted with the case, and earnestly desired the preservation of the ancient testimonies of truth, could feel otherwise? These conscientiously believed that he ought not to be received as a gospel minister in unity with Friends, until he in some way rectified, or condemned his attacks on our religious principles, as held and promulgated by the early standard writers in the society. But from a disposition to be kind and charitable, many suffered their better feelings to be lulled into a state of apathy and indifference, and out of deference to the man, and a secret desire gradually increasing, not only to be at ease, but also on the popular side of difficulty, they were soon prepared to join hand in hand not only to sustain, but to promote his cause in pushing forward the work of engrafting a new branch on the original stock, the bitter fruits of which on some occasions have already become distressingly apparent.

Some notice of bodies still claiming the title of Yearly Meetings in the Society of Friends, may properly claim attention at a suitable time. And although the harvest may appear abundant, and faithful laborers but few, yet, doubtless no inconsiderable number continue within the extended pale of society whose views have never changed, neither as regards principle nor expediency.

and whose allegiance to the cause of the unchangeable truth, can neither be bartered for, nor bought, no more than could the vineyard of Naboth, see 1 Kings, chapt. xxi, 1 to 25 v. To these may the encouraging language be addressed, "The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are his." 2 Tim. 11, 19.

In 1841, South Kingston Monthly Meeting, under a concern for the preservation of society on its ancient ground, made application to the Meeting for sufferings, in New England Yearly Meeting, requesting that body to take into consideration the published doctrinal writings of J. J. Gurney, (many of which were deemed by Friends of that meeting defective, and of dangerous tendency, and to decide whether they were in accordance with our ancient and well known principles, or otherwise. An application of like character from a number of Friends in another Quarterly Meeting, under a similar concern, was also made to that body. But no relief was obtained, either from the Meeting for sufferings, or from the author to whom application was also made.

Was not this a noble and honorable mode of asking redress, and for what? Not for grievances against themselves as individuals, or as Meetings. But that a check might be put to the current of unsoundness which had set in, to deluge the Society; and to shield the faith of a Fox, a Barclay, a Penn, and a Pennington from any further attacks, or even a continuation of those already offered, which like an internal sore was beginning to develop its withering, desolating effects.

And to whom was the application made? was it not to that very body whose authoritatively delegated duty it was, as watchmen upon the walls, to arrest any innovation that might present, to tarnish the faith, and thereby disturb the unity and harmony of society? And from this falling away of the Meeting for sufferings and the action of that Yearly Meeting in identifying itself with the man and his sentiments, may clearly be traced the state of things as they now exist within the limits of that Yearly Meeting. For an account of which the reader is referred to the Report of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting on that subject, and the conclusions arrived at in 1849, as published by the Meeting for sufferings of New England Yearly Meeting.

Philadelphia Meeting for sufferings on several occasions had the subject of unsound doctrines as written and published by a member or members of London Yearly Meeting, and in circulation amongst Friends in this country, before it, and feelingly

represented its uneasiness therewith, to the Meeting for sufferings of London. The subject of unsound doctrines written by members of London Yearly Meeting was also modestly, though pressingly, laid before that body, in the Epistolary correspondence of Phila. Yearly Meeting with it. But no reply that was ever received evinced that any care had been extended, or any regard paid to the concern, Friends in America felt, and had affectionately called their attention to. In 1846-7, the subject took such hold of the Meeting for sufferings of Phila., that a document was prepared by that body, and subsequently adopted by the Yearly Meeting, entitled an Appeal for the Ancient Doctrines of the Society, wherein an elaborate comparison was made between portions of the writings of J. J. Gurney, Dr. Edward Ash, and the early standard writers in the Society on the same subjects, and their discrepancies shown to be of a magnitude that elicited the following language, viz:—
 “This religion of sentiment and opinion, if it supplants, in those who are called upon to sustain the order and discipline of the Society, the influence of the heart changing illuminating power of the spirit of Christ, effectually blinds the eye, and disqualifies the mind for judging rightly in the important concerns of the Church.”

“As it affects the Minister, so must it affect the Elder, who would be no longer prepared to try words as the mouth tasteth meat, or to distinguish the plain unsophisticated Gospel Ministry, which stands in the demonstration of the spirit and of power, from the rhetoric of the fluent preacher, which fails to wound the man of sin.”

“Should this superficial religion prevail, it would introduce the spirit and maxims of the world into the very bosom of society.”

“Our meetings for worship, instead of being held in the name and power of Christ, might be rendered opportunities for bold and popular preachers to lead astray the people from the true fold. Having rejected the guide of life, we should be left to choose our own paths, and should inevitably fall into confusion and error. For if we cast aside our fundamental principle of the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and the government of the head of the church, we shall assuredly become the prey of unbelief and anarchy.”—*Page 65-6.*

A noble testimony.

“The children of Ephraim, being armed, and carrying bows, turned back in the day of battle.”—*Psalms 78, 9 v.*

In 1842, the meeting for sufferings in Ohio Yearly Meeting under a sense of religious duty, took up the subject of works

then in circulation, containing unsound doctrines, and forwarded to the meeting for sufferings of London Yearly Meeting, of which the author of works containing unsound sentiments was a member, informing that meeting with their uneasiness with those works.

In 1846, Ohio Yearly Meeting sent to London Yearly Meeting as follows, viz: "The peace and harmony of this Yearly Meeting in its several branches, as also in its collective capacity at the present season, have been greatly disturbed, on account of the doctrinal writings of a member or members of your Yearly Meeting, in circulation amongst us, which are not deemed by us to be in accordance with those on the same subjects, of our ancient approved authors."

In 1847, the Yearly Meeting again had the same subject before it, and after deliberation thereon, it was referred by minute to the meeting for sufferings, that body being encouraged to prepare a testification against the aforesaid objectionable writings; and in accordance therewith, the appeal for the ancient doctrines of the Society, contrasting those unsound views with the standard authors in the Society, as published by Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, was subsequently adopted.—*Philadelphia Friend*, Vol. XXVIII Page, 164.

Here is in some measure an exhibit of the deep concern and exercise many Friends were painfully burdened with, in that Yearly Meeting on account of the influx of Joseph John Gurney's unsound sentiments in circulation, and making inroads amongst them, and also of their modest, though earnest appeal to Friends in England to assist, not only in relieving them, but also all honestly concerned Friends throughout the Society from the fearful consequences which spontaneously result from innovation of doctrine; as that disturbs the very basis and ground work of our religious compact, and thereby our system of church polity may be diverted from its proper course, or thrown into a confused and vacillating condition.

To some it may have appeared rather strange that London Yearly Meeting should have treated the brotherly appeals of Friends in America on the subject of unsound doctrines with so little respect; or rather, to have manifested a determination to shield the accused author, but it is no marvel that it should be so, when we see and hear of private sentiments and public acts, which clearly indicate that J. J. Gurney was not alone either in principle or practice.

And although there is no desire felt to go into an elaborate ex-

position of this matter, yet a defence of the cause of truth seems to demand some further elucidation of facts, intimately connected with the state of our Society, The reader may therefore be presented with a few extracts from the life of William Allen in connection with some of the doings of London Yearly Meeting, which may tend to show that they were in unison of feeling, and acting in concert with Joseph John Gurney. It may be well to remember that William Allen was clerk to the select Yearly Meeting of London when J. J. Gurney was liberated to visit America. William Allen and some other members of the Meeting for sufferings in London Yearly Meeting being appointed to present an address on War to the Prince Regent Wm. Allen, says, "The plan was for the Prince to receive us in his closet. Our hats were taken off, and we had to wait about ten minutes;—we then respectfully withdrew keeping our faces towards him."—*Life of William Allen*, Vol. 1 p. 110.

"Vespers fervent—requesting to be enlisted in the Lord's service on any terms." 32

"Vespers constantly as usual." 39

"Called on Earl Spencer, at James's Palace, about Lancasterian, concerns to take him the vote of thanks." 121.

"To the city of London tavern, to meet the Managers of the London Institution. Went in the procession to Moorsfield, of see the first stone laid by Birck, the Lord Mayor, who made a very good speech on the occasion." 187

Though these exercises are not in our own manner, yet I like to see the disposition to religious re-union." Vol. 11 p. 102.

"Cornelius read to me the sheets of Joseph John Gurney's book on the peculiarities of Friends. I am much pleased with it." 129.

"Received a gold medal from the king of Prussia, who, in a letter addressed to Mrs. Elizabeth Fry, Mr. William Allen, and Mr. Samuel Gurney, returns his best thanks for our kind letter, 'united with the sincere wish,' (he says) that these three golden homage medals enclosed hereby, may afford you some pleasure, and be a constant remembrance of me." 505.

Wm. Allen's rep'y says, "The tokens of thy kind remembrance of my two friends and me, as expressed in the letter that accompanied the homage medals, which thou ordered to be delivered to us, were very cordial to our feelings, and we gratefully received them, not merely as coming from a king, whom we honor

and love, but from one whom we rejoice in being permitted to consider as a Christian friend.—506.

“Comment on this is needless ; but we cannot help thinking how John Woolman, Thomas Scattergood, or Richard Jordan, would have treated the proffer of a golden homage medal as an acknowledgment of the value entertained of his Gospel labors.”—*Philadelphia Friend*, Vol. XXI. p. 375.

In a letter addressed to J. J. Gurney, Wm. Allen says, “It was truly cordial to be thus affectionately remembered by one whose feelings, upon subjects of the highest interest to the great human family, are so fully in unison with my own.”—*Life*, 519.

Here is the example of one who made a high profession of Quakerism, and appears to have occupied almost every station by appointment, that society could confer upon him. A very distinguished and philanthropic man ; a minister, and prominent expounder of discipline in London Yearly Meeting, who might, with perfect propriety sit by the side of a J. J. Gurney. But how would he have felt in an old-fashioned meeting, seated by some of the sons of the morning in our Society. And would they not have said, who art thou that so lightly esteemest the testimonies of truth for which we so deeply suffered ? By thy appearance before the Prince Regent with head uncovered, and retiring in a manner as Lords and courtiers do ? Or when did any of the early Friends mix and mingle with Lords and Mayors and walk in procession to see the first, or corner stone laid of any Institution. Did they move a vote of thanks, or did they receive them, and particularly as a partner with a General Ma-caullay. Did they practice vespers ? Here we leave the reader with Wm. Allen’s own sample of his Quakerism depicted in his own language. And let us hear a few of Elizabeth Fry’s remarks, viz : “No outward names are in reality of much importance in my view ; nor do I think very much of membership with any outward sect or body of Christians ; my feeling is, that if we are but living members of the Church of Christ, this is the only membership essential to salvation.”—*Philadelphia Friend*, Vol. XXI., p. 285.

In a description of her visit to the King of Denmark she says : “Imagine me ; the King on one side and the Queen on the other ; and nothing but my poor French to depend upon.” After describing the dinner, she adds, “the fashion was to touch glasses ; no drinking of healths ; the King and Queen touched my glass on both sides.”—*Ibid*, 335.

On another occasion, when visiting with a minute of her Monthly Meeting on the Continent, at or near Geneva, in reference to an entertainment she attended, furnished by Colonel Troughin, she says: "To return to our entertainment, grace was very solemnly said before our meal, and very beautiful hymn singing afterwards." 350.

The reader may place his own estimate on E. Fry's Quakerism. In 1847, a memorial or testimony concerning Joseph John Gurney was issued by London Yearly Meeting, which contains this language, viz:

"Thus circumstanced, it became of great importance that he should be decided as to his religious course; and we find that, in his twenty-fourth year, he was brought into much serious thoughtfulness, and even conflict of mind, on the subject of uniting himself more closely to the Society of which he was a member by birth; and towards the close of the same year, resigning himself in the simplicity of a little child to the unerring guidance of the Holy Spirit, he was enabled, though surrounded by adverse circumstances, to make a full surrender; and he maintained, with holy boldness, the principles and testimonies of the Society through the remainder of his life." And again: "It will not be expected that we should here advert, at any length, to his writings; but it is right for us to express our belief, that in these undertakings, as in every other, he was actuated by a sincere desire to promote the glory of God, and the welfare of his fellow men; and at the same time to maintain, with unflinching integrity, the truth as it is in Jesus.

Is not this a full, entire, and unqualified endorsement and approval of, not only the writings, but the actions and doings of Joseph John Gurney?

If, then, his attacks on the doctrines, and integrity of the early and standard authors in the Society are "believed by London Yearly meeting to have been called for to promote the glory of God, and the welfare of his fellow men," and needed to "maintain, with unflinching integrity, the truth as it is in Jesus," where, may we not solemnly and sorrowfully ask, does London Yearly Meeting now stand? But further; let the reader impartially examine the Yearly Meeting's testimony and endorsement of J. J. Gurney's "undertakings" and actions, one of which was so admirably displayed at a dinner in Buxton's Brewery; and judge whether he was then "maintaining the principles and testimonies of the Society with holy boldness," or, with "un-

flinching integrity, the truth as it is in Jesus." Or rather let the reader determine for himself how much of the "life of Christianity was inwardly ruling in his heart," on that occasion; and subsequently ruling in the hearts of those who gave it a full endorsement. That life, which gathered our forefathers to be a people, and through their obedience preserved them in the truth.

Here follows the account, (or a portion of it,) as published in the *Philadelphia Friend*, Vol. XXI., No. 41, p. 324:—

"The party arrived at about six o'clock, and consisted of the Lord Chancellor, (Brougham), Lord Grey, Duke of Richmond, Marquis of Cleaveland, Lords Shaftsbury, Selton, Howick, Durham and Duncannon, General Alava, (Samuel) Gurney, Dr. Lushington, Spring Rice, W. Brougham, J. J. Gurney, R. Hansbury, &c., twenty-three in all.

"At dinner I (T. F. Buxton) gave but two toasts; the King, and the memory of George III., whose birth-day it was. We had no speeches, but conversation flowed, or rather roared, like a torrent, at our end of the table.

"The Chancellor lost not a moment; he was always eating, drinking, talking, or laughing; his powers of laughing seemed on a level with his other capacities."

"J. J. Gurney after giving a lively synopsis of certain conversations which took place, thus adds:—

"The Chancellor was very cordial, and we were all delighted with his entertaining rapidity of thought, ready wit, and evident good feeling. Nor was it possible to be otherwise than pleased with all our guests, with whom we parted, about eleven o'clock at night, after a flowing and exhilarating, and not altogether an un-instructive day." The *Friend* remarks: "What should we have thought if we had heard of George Fox, Isaac Pennington, John Woolman, or any other of our old and solid friends, attending such dinner parties, mingling with such characters as were then assembled,—voluntarily listening to toasts, and crowning all with being delighted with the drinking, we might perhaps safely say drunken Chancellor?

"J. J. Gurney thus delicately hints how he spoke a good word with the Premier, Lord Grey, concerning his friend, the Bishop of Norwich. 'I ventured to insinuate that there was no part of a Premier's office more responsible than that of making Bishops. He assented, adding, 'you know I have had none to make at present.' We talked of the Bishop of Norwich. Lord Grey expressed his admiration of his conduct and character, though

he only knew him in his public capacity. 'I fear the Bishop is too old to accept any offer that I can make him, but I assure you that the very first and best thing that I have to give away shall be at his service.'"

"We are informed in J. J. Gurney's letter, that the Premier remembered his promise, and offered to transfer this hireling spiritual shepherd to the Bishopric of Dublin, thereby adding to his official importance, and the pecuniary gain of his station; but the offer was declined, it would seem, on account of age and infirmities."

"Who need wonder "that the Bishop of Norwich should have preached an eulogistic funeral sermon for Joseph John Gurney."

This remarkable season of festivity and night revelry, appears to have occurred in 1831, when J. J. Gurney was in about the 43rd year of his age and the 14th of his ministry; and not many years previous to visiting America.

The reader might profitably compare the preceding statement with an account given in the *Friend*, Vol. XXII, p. 76-7, of the faithfulness and prophetic testimony of John Exham, against very similar seasons of revelry, practised by the Earl of Orrery in Ireland. During one such season of revelling and debauch, he believed it to be his religious duty to go to the Earl's dwelling and warn the company of the consequences which must result from their doings! And then prophetically told them, "that the stately mansion so often disgraced by their revelling, should be made desolate, and become a habitation for the fowls of the air." The literal fulfilment of which prediction, as well as some others equally remarkable, he lived to witness.—*Library, Vol. III., p. 487.*

It may now be proper to turn to the state of society and compare latter with former things, inasmuch as principle changeth not, though men may, and do change, and who pleadeth so much for charity, as he that feareth the reproofs of instruction. What was the offence of Eli the High Priest? Was it not that his sons abused the station they occupied until they made themselves vile, and he restrained them not? His love and his charity were so unbounded, that the fruit thereof brought not only his own destruction and that of his whole house, but it stopped not here; the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord, which had been removed from Shiloh, was taken by the Philistines, and the Israelites were discomfited by a very great slaughter. See 1st

Samuel, IV., 11, 17, 18. May the present profit by the experience of the past.

Was it not considered in the days of 1827-8 that such meetings or bodies, let their name or title, their numbers and location be what they would, and where they might, which received, acknowledged and accredited Elias Hicks as a Gospel minister after his unsoundness was fully apparent, ought to be, and of right were, deemed as in unity with him and his doctrinal views, and nothing to the contrary appearing, such meetings and individuals were considered, and treated by Friends, as seceders from the faith of the Society. True, the degeneracy in principle and consequent disaffection which produced the bitter fruit of that eventful period, were first fully matured and brought to bear in Philadelphia, instead of New England Yearly Meeting.

And how did it work? Ezra Comfort (a minister) and Isaiah Bell (as companion) attended the Southern Quarterly Meeting, where Elias Hicks was also in attendance, and preached what those two individuals deemed unsound doctrines; and so they reported, (although nearly all the members of that Quarterly Meeting manifested no uneasiness with them, or rather had unity with him and his sentiments,) for which they were brought under church censure, and disowned by their Monthly Meeting, which was confirmed by the Quarter, but they appealed to the Yearly Meeting, and were reinstated to their rights, and former position. The charge against them was as follows, viz :—

“Ezra Comfort and Isaiah Bell are charged with propagating and spreading a report of unsound doctrines against a minister of our religious Society travelling with a certificate of unity from the Monthly and Quarterly Meeting of which he is a member, without first informing him of their uneasiness therewith when in company with him.”

Here follows a copy of E. Comfort's testimony of disownment :
 “Ezra Comfort having had a right of membership amongst the religious Society of Friends, but has been so unguarded as to propagate and spread a report of unsound doctrines against a Minister of our religious Society, (travailing with a minute of unity from the Monthly and Quarterly Meeting of which he was a member,) without first informing him of his uneasiness therewith when in company with him; on which account he has been patiently treated with to convince him of his error, but it appears without having had the desired effect. Therefore, we hereby certify that he is no longer a member of our religious

Society; nor will be considered as such until he condemns his error to the satisfaction of this meeting, which we desire he may be enabled to do."

How remarkably similar were the two cases of John Wilbur and Ezra Comfort, except, that the complaint against E. Comfort appears to have been brought officially before his Monthly Meeting, and he treated within all respects consistently with order and the letter of the discipline. John Wilbur entirely the reverse.

But did not the prompting, efficient cause in both cases spring from the same corrupt root, to shield and support an unsound Ministry.

And it is presumed that upon this ground Ezra Comfort was reinstated; as would not a confirmation of his disownment by the Yearly Meeting have implicated that body with the unsound doctrines of Elias Hicks, and given an impetus to his cause which it would have been difficult to have recovered from, under a rigid adherence to the rules of order, and a strict observance of the letter of discipline, in accordance with the expounders of it in the present day; wherein numerical strength and popular opinion seem too much to constitute the touchstone of Quakerism; principle having become, apparently, of but secondary consideration.

To illustrate the value of the sentiment, a portion of an article in the *Philadelphia Friend*, Vol. II., p. 62-3, may be quoted, viz: "But what, I ask, has this (majorities) to do with the principle laid down by Robert Barclay? Suppose, for instance, that the majority of a Monthly Meeting should fall into gross immorality, such as drunkenness, profane swearing, fighting &c., would not those who remained upright and consistent with their profession, though the smaller number, have an undoubted right to disown the disorderly ones? I will state the case still further; suppose that seventy-five, or, if the reader please, ninety-five out of a hundred, were to enter into military pursuits, or to purchase and hold slaves—would not the minority have a right to disown them? The answer is obvious. But it will be said that these cases consist of conduct, and not merely opinion. Admit it—still it proves that minorities, in certain cases, had the right to disown members." The writer has not defined the manner or mode whereby the minority, in a case as supposed, would be able to effect said disownment; if a Monthly Meeting were to become thus affected, so might a Quarterly Meeting, and a Yearly Meeting might be no less degenerate. It may be said

that would be an extreme case ; but it is altering no position. Let us suppose a little further, although it scarcely needs supposition ; it would hardly fail to be a fact ; that a Monthly, Quarterly and Yearly Meeting thus affected, would all have clerks and other officers under appointment, of the supposed description of members, in whose hands the entire government and control of meetings, and the administration of the discipline might be permanently placed ; or at least stand out of the reach of the minority, or one-twentieth part of the members, who would most likely be obnoxious to the ruling power vested in unhallowed hands. (May not the work of degeneracy in principle be no less gradual in the development of its operations than the work of regeneration.) And here, again, the question naturally arises which has not been defined—through what possible channel could the few effect any disownment ? If they are not to separate, this being considered a breach of order, repugnant to discipline, and extremely uncharitable, is not their case inevitably sealed ? But might it not very properly be defined as an anomaly, to meet which, no letter of discipline has ever yet been framed. Then must not their escape depend entirely on the pointings of truth, and the particular circumstances under which they are placed. Had John Comly been the regularly constituted clerk of Philadelphia Yearly meeting in 1827., could he not, with that portion of the meeting which united with him, have carried their schemes of operation over the heads of sound friends without any palpable violation of the rules of order, the letter of the discipline, or of our church government. And who amongst us would have contended that they were really and truly the legitimate Yearly meeting of Philadelphia ? We may here remember that in Philadelphia was the starting point of difficulty, as a Yearly meeting in 1827, and latterly in New England.

Let us now submit the whole case of difficulty to Robert Barclay, who went beyond the reasoning power of man for his remedy. He says: "If the Apostles of Christ of old, and the preachers of the everlasting Gospel in this day had told all people, however wrong they found them in their faith and principles, our charity and love is such, we dare not judge you nor separate from you ; but let us all live in love together, and every one enjoy his own opinion, and all will be well. How should the nations have been ? Or what way now can they be brought to truth and righteousness ? Would not the Devil love this doctrine well, by which darkness and ignorance, error and confusion,

might still continue in the earth unproved and uncondemned?" *Works, Vol. I., p. 515.*

And again: "What need then of sound doctrine, if no doctrine make unsound? What need of convincing and exhorting gainsayers, if to gainsay be no crime? Where should the unity of the faith be? Were not this an inlet to all manner of abomination? And to make void the whole tendency of Christ and his apostles' doctrine? And render the Gospel of non effect? And give a liberty to the inconstant and giddy will of man to innovate, alter and overturn it at his pleasure? So that from all that is above mentioned, we do safely conclude, that where a people are gathered together into the belief of the principles and doctrines of the Gospel of Christ, if any of that people (without limitation as to number, even the nineteen twentieths) shall go from their principles, and assert things false and contrary to what they have already received; such as stand and abide firm in the faith, (if but the one-twentieth) have power by the Spirit of God, after they have used christian endeavors to convince and reclaim them, upon their obstinacy, to separate from such, and to exclude them from their spiritual fellowship and communion; for otherways if this be denied, farewell to all christianity, or to the maintaining of any sound doctrine in the church of Christ."—*Ibid* 516, 17

If Robert Barclay had lived, and written the foregoing, in the nineteenth century could it have been more appropriately adapted to the condition of society in our day.

And as that matter may now be considered as well disposed of, it may be proper to proceed with saying, that as the arbitrary proceedings of New England Yearly Meeting &c., have been animadverted upon, and John Wilburs case also examined in the report of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting in relation to the facts and causes of the division which occurred in New England Yearly Meeting in 1845. The reader is therefore referred to that document as published by the meeting for sufferings in New England Yearly Meeting.

Said report fully and emphatically sustains Swanzey Monthly Meeting of the smaller body; as the true, legitimate, and original Monthly Meeting, using this language; "to us, therefore, it appears clear, that the meeting which, with its old clerk at the table proceeded in the transaction of its business after the others had adjourned, in no way lost its standing as Swanzey Monthly Meeting, and that the others separated from it; and that those who in Rhode Island Quarterly Meeting, received the report

from the latter, and rejected that from the former, identified themselves with the separate Meeting." Then does it not follow that those who rejected the report from the latter, and received that from the former, identified themselves with the true Monthly Meeting of Swanzev. And were of course Rhode Island Quarterly Meeting.

The report proceeds; "Although the manner in which this separation (in the Yearly Meeting) was effected was not such as, we think, affords a precedent safe to be followed in the organization of a Yearly Meeting, yet inasmuch as those friends who compose the smaller body appear to have acted from a sincere desire to maintain the doctrines and discipline of the Society, and the rights secured by it to all its members; and had been subjected to proceedings oppressive in their character, and in violation of the acknowledged principles of our Church government, we believe that they continue to be entitled to the rights of membership and to such acknowledgment by their brethren as may be necessary for securing the enjoyment of those rights."

If those friends who compose the smaller body continue to be "entitled to the rights of membership, and to such acknowledgment by their brethren as may be necessary for securing the enjoyment of those rights," certainly they have not seceded from the society; and if so, do they not still continue to hold New England Yearly Meeting as a superior, in unity with, and to which the true Quarterly Meeting of Rhode Island, and Monthly Meeting of Swanzev, are subordinate and constituent branches.

That the precedent would not be safe to be followed in the organization of a (new) Yearly Meeting, does not appear to apply to the sustaining of a Yearly Meeting on its original organization or ground, and particularly so, when the maintenance of the doctrines and discipline of the society, are acknowledged to have been the alone ground of action.

Does it not follow, that if there is but one true Monthly Meeting of Swanzev, and that of the smaller body; that as certainly there can be but one true Yearly Meeting of New England and can that that be in unity with the separate Monthly Meeting of Swanzev?

The position assumed by Ohio Yearly Meeting in 1846 was never on any subsequent occasion abrogated or changed up to the time of the separation. And that position was, that "the peace and harmony of this yearly meeting in its several branches, as also in its collective capacity at the present season, have been greatly disturbed on account of the doctrinal writings of a mem-

ber or members of your (London) Yearly meeting in circulation amongst us, which are not deemed by us, to be in accordance with those, on the same subjects of our ancient approved authors."

Here we have a clear, unqualified avowal in an official production of that Yearly Meeting, of what was really the true basis and ground work of the difficulties and dissensions existing among its members. And so they continued unabatedly to exist, to the time of the separation; when a minor portion of the members of that Yearly Meeting set up their standard for the support and advancement of the cause of Gurneyism; and became allied, by opening an epistolary correspondence of acknowledged fellowship with that body in New England, which had disfranchized meetings and members, for endeavoring "to maintain the doctrines and discipline of the society, and the rights secured by it to all its members." And had subjected "them to proceedings oppressive in their character, and in violation of the acknowledged principles of our church government."—*Philadelphia Report*.

And which had substantially based itself on that platform, and fully recognized and owned as a subordinate branch, in unity of action, and harmony of feeling, that body claiming the title of Swanzev Monthly Meeting, which the Philadelphia Report has virtually pronounced to be a body of separatists.

In 1854, two epistles were presented to Baltimore Yearly Meeting, one signed by Benjamin Hoyle as clerk, and the other by Jonathan Binns. The meeting was thus at once brought into difficulty; and appointed a committee to consider the case and report to a future sitting. That Committee were divided in sentiment; the major portion being entirely prepared to receive the epistle signed by J. Binns as clerk, and to recognize that body as the Ohio Yearly Meeting.

The other portion of that committee, conscientiously believing that such a course would not only be swerving from a faithful adherence to, and support of, the doctrines and testimonies of the early friends; but would be a formal acknowledgement and sanctioning of the new schemes of modified Quakerism, and betraying of the trust reposing in them, objected to the proposed course, but to no avail. The clerk and the majority of the meeting being fully prepared for the majority report, an alliance with that body in Ohio of which Jonathan Binns was clerk, was soon effected.

The question propounded by the prophet Amos was then to be determined, "can two walk together except they be agreed?"

When a remnant of the meeting (and not below the standard of numbers with a Barclay) could find no course consistent with

the conscientious convictions of their own minds on that very trying occasion, but to dissent from the action of the major part of the Meeting, and remain quietly together at the close of that sitting and endeavor to sustain and continue Baltimore Yearly Meeting on the original ground of primitive Quakerism, and in a manner which in the days of 1828, would have received the warmest approbation and approval of Friends holding the same faith, everywhere.

Is evidence wanting that in these days the views and feelings of many have materially changed, and in their zeal for an outside show of order, and the maintenance of their construction and application of the letter of discipline, is there not danger of forgetting the doctrine of a Barclay, and leaving principle almost entirely out of view?

In the days of 1827-8, Friends were strongly encouraged to maintain their ground against innovation of doctrine, with unyielding integrity and firmness, at any sacrifice it might cost them. And no doubt that advice was administered under some sense of that, which gathered our forefathers to the standard of truth, and kept them there, before they had any outward or written rules of discipline; and which taught them not to put the letter before, or above that, which alone giveth and preserveth life; and which experience has sorrowfully shown, may be converted, when administered by unsanctified hands, into an engine of oppression, both to the seed of life, and to those who endeavor to dwell therein.

Did not Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, in 1828, bear a decided consistent testimony against the doctrines of Elias Hicks, as being opposed to primitive Quakerism, and against the fruits resulting from their adoption or encouragement?

And did it not, in its Appeal for the Ancient Doctrines of the Society, issued in 1847, bear a no less decided and unwavering testimony against the doctrines of Joseph John Gurney, as equally opposed to the principles of primitive Quakerism, as held and most surely believed by the early Friends? Then upon what ground (with any degree of consistency) can Philadelphia Yearly Meeting relax in carrying out its testimony against the fruits resulting from either the adoption or encouragement of J. J. Gurney's sentiments.

Does not said Appeal emphatically determine Gurneyism to be a religion of sentiment and opinion, at page 65? And again at page 66 it says: 'Should this superficial religion prevail?' &c. And does not the language of the Appeal throughout, determine Gurneyism

to be, not only at variance with primitive Quakerism, but as opposite thereto as the sentiments of Elias Hicks, with their concomitant appendages?

Why, then, should the candle, which has been lighted, be put as under a bed or under a bushel, and not on the candle stick, that its light may be seen?

Elias Hicks exceedingly undervalued the Holy Scriptures, calling them 'A nose of wax,' 'Mystery Babylon,' 'That which the wisdom of man has devised,' and much more not needful here to mention.

J. J. Gurney designates the Bible, 'The Written Word, 'The Waters of Life,' 'The more sure word of Prophecy, 'that the Bible alone, fully reveals the nature and character of sin,' &c.

And on most other important points of doctrine wherein Elias Hicks departed from the primitive standard of Quakerism, J. J. Gurney has taken a no less diverging course, though in an opposite direction. And no wonder if the fruits resulting therefrom should be analogous.

That Friends of Baltimore Yearly Meeting in 1828, did right in coming out of their difficulties as they did, has scarcely been doubted; and in conformation thereof, it is stated in the *Philad'a Friend*, vol. 2, page 39, that "every member of Baltimore Yearly Meeting, (in 1828) who continued to meet with the party after they thus had fully identified themselves with the new sect, was lending his influence and according his assent to those practices and doctrines.

And again at 61, "The statements we have already made, show, in the clearest manner, that, in order to retain their connection with the society, and to support its doctrines and discipline, Friends of Baltimore Yearly Meeting had no alternative left, but to meet apart from those who had seceded from its communion and attach itself to the new Society of Hicksites."

Now, admitting this statement to be entirely correct, who can any more doubt the purity of motive and consistency of action of the minor portion of Friends of Baltimore Yearly Meeting in 1854 than in 1828, "that in order to retain their connection with the Society, and to support its doctrines and discipline," (as they apprehended) they really believed they "had no alternative left but to meet apart from those who had seceded from its communion, and attach themselves to the new Society" of Gurneyites.

And that every member who continued to meet with the party after they had thus fully identified themselves with the new sect,

was lending his influence and according his assent, to those practices and doctrines.

On the subject of discipline and its administration, that worthy Friend, John Richardson, remarks, that discipline "is a good fence, and a help to keep the righteous in, and hurtful and wicked things and doings out, if the same be rightly handled and extended as it ought to be, in the love and wisdom of God.—*Library Vol. IV. P. 96.*

And Job Scot (whom S. L. Grubb calls a star of the first magnitude) says: "Discipline in the life is an excellent thing. But my soul hath seen and felt with inexpressible sorrow, that out of the Life, the administration of it in the letter, killeth, will kill, and has killed many who began in the spirit, and who are now vainly laboring to be made perfect in the flesh."

Each Yearly Meeting claims the prerogative to make, revise, alter and annul, its own rules of Discipline, whenever officially brought before that body, and legitimately acted upon; and such revision, amendment and alteration have, on various occasions, been made. But not so with doctrines. No assumption of power, has ever conferred the privilege of change, without a forfeiture of the original title of "Friends."

And inasmuch as vital and important changes of discipline have lately been made, no doubt in evidence of the fructifying properties of Gurneyism, it may be well to advert to a few cases; and the inquiry might, with great propriety, be instituted, how far those changes can extend, and the body effecting them still retain its standing as a co-ordinate branch of the religious Society of Friends.

Wherever such changes in discipline conflict with primitive Quakerism, how are they to be tolerated?

In most, if not all, those bodies in America, claiming the title of Yearly Meetings, the Memoirs of Joseph John Gurney, and many of his doctrinal writings have been extensively circulated.

And one of the largest (Indiana) which some years back forbade J. J. Gurney's essays on Christianity being admitted into the monthly and Preparative meeting libraries, has since repealed that mandate, and encouraged its circulation. As a sample of the sentiments contained in that work, (now endorsed by Indiana Yearly meetings) the reader has J. J. Gurney's definition and application of faith, (and also reason) at page 9 which is worthy of attention. And other bodies, either in the capacity of a Yearly meeting, or by its meeting for sufferings, have sent down

written instructions to subordinate meetings to receive certain writings of the said author J. J. Gurney into monthly or Preparative meeting libraries; placing them thereby not only within the notice, but so that their attractive influence may reach the reading and junior members of society. Thus inflicting an unhealing wound in the minds of such Friends as feel conscientiously bound to bear testimony against his (as Thomas Shillitor calls them) 'Episcopalian principles.'

London Yearly Meeting has, some time since, changed its discipline, so as entirely to relieve its members from a testimony (which our forefathers, in the truth maintained, no doubt, from a divine impulse) against grave stones as monuments for the dead, and other propositions of no less vitality and importance to the welfare and preservation of the religious Society of Friends, have either been acted on by that body, or held under consideration.

And must not these things be wounding to the honest hearted, who feel still bound to the law and to the testimony, and not prepared to cast away the shield as though it had not been anointed with oil.

Dublin Yearly Meeting, which is scarcely other than subordinate to London; as it sends its report comprising its answers to the queries, and a quorum of representatives to London Yearly Meeting; and its members, when there, appear eligible to appointment; and an individual disowned in Ireland on some account has a right to appeal from the decision of Dublin Yearly Meeting to London, which has full authority to reinstate the Appellant.

And Dublin members in accordance with parental example have also abandoned their testimony against grave stones for the dead.

And that body in New York City, still claiming the title of a Yearly Meeting of Friends appears to have outstripped all the rest of its associates; having not only abandoned its testimony against grave stones, or monuments for the dead, but in other respects, changed and modified its rules of discipline, so that a member may now marry one that is not a member, (even a Roman Catholic) by the assistance of an hireling minister, (or any way the parties may desire) and by an easy mode of procedure, be continued in membership, without either the individual or the Monthly Meeting condemning the act. Thus, with the liberal views inherent to Gurneyism, they lay aside, or rather wantonly throw away the testimony of the Society of Friends, against an hireling ministry; for the faithful maintenance of which our forefathers in the truth so deeply suffered, both in person and estate. Shall any doubt the correctness of these statements, he may

consult the *British Friend*, the *London Friend*, and *Philadelphia Friend*.

The reader may now judge for himself, and form his own conclusions, relative to the source from whence has arisen in our Society, the trials and conflicts of the present day.

Desiring that he may not deem this plain and honest exposition of facts, as the product of an uncharitable spirit; but let him bear in mind that, the Apostle Paul, (an example to all believers) who eulogized charity, and no doubt practised it in an eminent degree; withstood Peter to his face, for his dissimulation; warned his brethren repeatedly, to beware of false doctrines; and was unsparing in his condemnation of error.

And whithersoever he journeyed, he laboured diligently to remove wrong things, and the perpetrators of them, out of the Church

And the Savior of men spoke emphatically of burdens being laid on men's shoulders, grievous to be borne; while those who bound them there, would not move them with one of their fingers. *Matthew xx. iii.*

And cannot many vouch for its truth in the present day? If in those days there was no concord between light and darkness, between truth and error, why should there now be? Has the foundation been changed? Or does their still remain but the Rock and the Sand to build upon? Should any assume a medium ground whereon to erect a structure? Was it not so with the church of the Laodicians, to whom this language, was addressed? "I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot; I would thou wert cold or hot, so then, because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth."—*Rev. iii. xv. xvi.*

